

Application Serial No. 10/669,118  
Response to Office Action dated August 16, 2007  
Amendment dated September 23, 2007

**REMARKS**

This is in response to the Office Action mailed January 11, 2007. By this Amendment, claims 1-27 are in this application.

Applicant acknowledges and appreciates that in the Office Action of 01/11/2007, claim 17, 19 and 21 were indicated allowable, provided that the claims would be rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant reserves the right to take such action in a further response; however, Applicant believes that in light of the following discussion and proposed changes to the claims, all the claims presently in this application should now be in condition for allowance.

To begin with, in the Amendment submitted herewith, certain corrections are being made to claim 7, 13, 19 and 21, such that these claims are proper antecedent basis and are definite.

In addition, claims 23-27 are being provided herewith, which also define the invention in a manner which is patentable. Claim 23, which is based on allowable claim 17, describes the locating sleeve having a notch located in radial alignment with the vent orifice. For the same reason claim 17 was allowed, new claim 23, which depends from independent claim 22 should likewise be allowed.

Application Serial No. 10/669,118  
Response to Office Action dated August 16, 2007  
Amendment dated September 23, 2007

New claims 24-27 bring out that the locating sleeve is discontinuous, and includes a notch. Similar to the arguments for allowability of claims 17, 19 and 21, new claims 24-27 should likewise be allowable, as none of the art discloses or suggests such a locating sleeve.

Applicant notes that the remaining claims 1-16, 18, 20 and 22 stand rejected over Maxwell in view of Cline and Mack. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the proposed combination of these patents. Applicant points out that Mack, U.S. Patent No. 7,014,766, fails to comply with the requirements under 35 USC § 102 and 103, for being an applicable piece of prior art against the present invention. Namely, the present invention has a filing date of August 23, 2003. Mack has at best a priority date of January 23, 2004, i.e., the filing date of the application in the United States. Applicant therefore submits that the Mack reference is inappropriate to use in such combination with the Maxwell and Cline references. Since Maxwell and Cline fail to disclose or suggest the subject matter as in claims 1-16, 18, 20, and 22, these claims should be allowed. As such, reconsideration of the previous rejection is respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that all the claims currently in the application should now be in condition for allowance. Prompt notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Application Serial No. 10/669,118  
Response to Office Action dated August 16, 2007  
Amendment dated September 23, 2007

Nevertheless, should the Examiner continue to believe otherwise, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone, should the Examiner believe it would result in a furtherance of this matter.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher F. Hunter, Reg. 34,187  
Attorney for Applicants  
Parker-Hannifin Corporation  
6035 Parkland Boulevard  
Cleveland, Ohio 44124-4141  
Telephone: (216) 896-2461  
Fax: (216) 896-4027  
e-mail: chunter@parker.com